

REMARKS

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claim rejections set forth in the Office Action dated June 7, 2006.

Summary

Claim 1 was amended. No new matter has been added as a result of this amendment.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, and 20 were cancelled.

Claims Rejections

Claims 1, 3 – 14, 18 – 20 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,744,933) in view of Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,556,837). Claim 2 was rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Kobayashi et al. and in further view of Fernandez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,184,651). Claims 15 – 17 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Kobayashi et al. and in further view of Binder (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,115).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a plurality of chargers and a circuit that drives a charger that sends electromagnetic waves to the object from an optimal direction.

Inoue et al. fail to disclose a control circuit that drives a charger that sends electromagnetic waves to the object from an optimal direction. Inoue et al. disclose a contrary arrangement. More specifically, Inoue et al. teach that “a second battery of the mobile phone, attaches the mobile phone to the charging means” (Column 2, Line 67 – Column 3, Line 1). Inoue et al. fail to disclose electromagnetic waves. A single charging means is provided to charge the second battery. Inoue et al. also fail to disclose a plurality of chargers. Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over the cited prior art.

Kobayashi et al. fail to disclose a control circuit that drives a charger that sends electromagnetic waves to the object from an optimal direction. The arrangement disclosed by Kobayashi et al. is entirely different than the arrangement recited in present Claim 1. Kobayashi et al. fail to teach a plurality of chargers and a control circuit

that drives a charger that sends electromagnetic waves to the object from an optimal direction. Kobayashi et al. teach a contrary arrangement. Kobayashi et al. teach a single charger 200 that charges multiple secondary batteries in the electronic clinical thermometers 100 (Column 8; Lines 9 – 14). A container 224 “is employed for housing electronic clinical thermometers” (Column 7, Lines 59 – 61). The container 224 is surrounded by a single charger 200 with coils L11. In fact, as taught by Kobayashi et al. the inductance coupling is dependent on the distance and angle between coil L11 and the L21 (Column 8, Lines 17 – 19). For example, “the smaller the angle formed between the coils L11, L21 is, the greater the degree of such inductive coupling is induced” (Column 8, Lines 18 – 20). Thus, Kobayashi et al. teaches sending the electromagnetic waves from a single direction. Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over the cited prior art.

Fernandez et al. fail to disclose a control circuit that drives a charger that sends electromagnetic waves to the object from an optimal direction. Fernandez et al. disclose a contrary arrangement. More specifically, Fernandez et al. teach a primary coil 13 inductively coupled to a secondary coil 15 (Column 3, Lines 59 – 60). The “energy coupled from the primary coil 13 is applied through the secondary coil 15 to charge the battery 21” (Column 3, Lines 64 – 65). “A primary controller used as a primary charging device 11” is used to control the primary coil 13 (Column 3, Lines 56 – 57). Fernandez et al. only discloses a single charger. As seen in Figure 2, the coupling between coils 29 and 31 is used to provide feedback to the primary controller 11 and not as a charger for the battery 21 (Column 5, Lines 5 – 23). Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over the cited prior art.

Dependent Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17 and 19 depend from allowable Claim 1, so are allowable for at least this reason.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons presented above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200